

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,816	08/28/2003	Emmanuel Kanterakis	57042-081	5994
20277	7590 02/23/2005		EXAM	INER
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP			BOCURE, TESFALDET	
600 13TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2631	

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/649,816	KANTERAKIS ET	AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Tesfaldet Bocure	2631			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover shee	t with the correspondence ad	dress		
THE - External after of the control	MORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. To period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stareply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, ma reply within the statutory minimum of iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) I tute, cause the application to becom	y a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely MONTHS from the mailing date of this or e ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23	3 September 2003.		•		
·	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)□	,—					
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.		·		
Applicat	ion Papers					
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Exame The drawing(s) filed on 23 September 2003. Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the contribution of the oath or declaration is objected to by the	is/are: a)⊠ accepted or the drawing(s) be held in abe rection is required if the draw	yance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). ing(s) is objected to. See 37 CF	FR 1.121(d).		
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the p application from the International Bure See the attached detailed Office action for a least	ents have been received. ents have been received in riority documents have be eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n Application No en received in this National	Stage		
Attachmen	t(c)					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Intervie	w Summary (PTO-413)			
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔯 Infor	the of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/sr No(s)/Mail Date 12/17/03&6/30/04.	Paper	No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTC)-152)		

Application/Control Number: 10/649,816

Art Unit: 2631

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The Information Disclosure Statements (IDSs) received December 17, 2003 and June 30, 2004 have been considered by the Examiner, and the initialed copies (two copies) of the 1449 are attached with this correspondence.

Double Patenting

2. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,639,936. This is a double patenting rejection. Examiner cannot substantiate the difference between the claimed invention in the instant application and that U.S. Patent No. 6,639,936.

Double Patenting

4. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain <u>a</u> patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re*

Application/Control Number: 10/649,816 Page 3

Art Unit: 2631

Ockert, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

- 5. Claims 1-4 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-4 of copending Application No. 10/667,665. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.
- 6. Examiner cannot substantiate the difference between the claimed invention in the instant application and that of 10/667,665.

Double Patenting

7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Application/Control Number: 10/649,816

Art Unit: 2631

8. Claim 3 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claim 1 of U. S. Patent No. 6,639,939 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: The claimed subject matter in claim 1 of the instant application differs from that of U.S. Patent No. 6,639,936 in that it has been claimed as a method claim in the instant application and as an apparatus claim in the U. S. Patent No. 6,639,939. However, you cannot infringe the method without an apparatus and viseversa, i.e., the claimed method having a corresponding steps should be performed by a respective circuitry in the apparatus and the other way too.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. IEE publication, "Common Packet Channel (CPCH): The optimum wireless Internet mechanism in W-CDMA," Dr. Kourosh Parsa discloses a collision resolution and power control in CDMA transmission system.

Application/Control Number: 10/649,816 Page 5

Art Unit: 2631

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tesfaldet Bocure whose telephone number is (571) 272-3015. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur (7:30a-5:00p) & Mon.-Fri (7:30a-5:00p).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad H Ghayour can be reached on (571) 272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

T.Bocure